



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/631,119	07/31/2003	Robert J. Mauceri JR.	MICR0408	2462
27792	7590	11/01/2006	EXAMINER	
RONALD M. ANDERSON MICROSOFT CORPORATION 600 108TH AVENUE N.E., SUITE 507 BELLEVUE, WA 98004			BOTTs, MICHAEL K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	

DATE MAILED: 11/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/631,119	MAUCERI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Michael K. Botts	2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 August 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on August 8, 2006 has been entered.
2. Applicants' attention is directed to the fact that a new Examiner has been assigned to this case. The Examiner's name and telephone number are provided below.
3. It is noted that a Petition was filed by Applicants on August 17, 2006. The Petition was filed after the Request for Continued Examination (RCE), and the relief requested in the Petition does not affect the Examiner's response to the RCE. Therefore, the Petition is hereby noted, but not considered to be relevant this Office Action.
4. Claims 1-22 have been examined, with claims 1,14, and 21 being the independent claims.
5. Claims 1-22 are rejected.

The Specification

6. Applicant is reminded of the requirement to update the status (pending, allowed, etc.) of all parent priority applications in the first line of the specification, when

appropriate, and the status of all citations of U.S. filed applications in the specification should also be updated, when appropriate.

Claims Rejection – 35 U.S.C. 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Rempell (U.S. Patent Application Publication 20040148307A1, filed January 24, 2003) [hereinafter “Rempell”], in view of Teague, “DHTML and CSS for the world wide web,” Peach Pit Press, published May 22, 2001 [hereinafter “Teague”].

Regarding independent claim 1, Rempell in view of Teague teaches:

A computer-implemented method for automatically formatting a table to reflect a change in a visual appearance of a decorative panel that comprises a plurality of separate but visually related regions defined by the table, so that the table is formatted in regard to all visually related regions affected by the change in the visual appearance as a function of at least one attribute of an element of the table corresponding to the change in the visual appearance, comprising the steps of:

(a) detecting the change in the visual appearance of the decorative panel;

(b) associating the visual appearance of the decorative panel with at least one element of the table;

(See, Rempell, figure 37, and paragraph [0010], teaching that the interface includes a panel (item 400) the build frame (item 500), and its objects, including a menu bar (item 410), pop-up windows (item 480), the panel's interface objects, tool bar (item 440) color and alert message interface technologies, built with HTML, Dynamic HTML (DHTML), JavaScript, and Cascading Style Sheets (CSS).)

(c) determining a revision to the at least one attribute of the at least one element of the table corresponding to the change in the visual appearance of the decorative panel; and

(See, Rempell, figures 46 and 47, and paragraph [0120] teaching a visualization of an implementation of a JavaScript child window, wherein a change text button style pop-up window, Screen shot FIG. 47, shows the result after the user selected the "Define the Mouse Down Text Button Style" child pop-up window.)

(d) automatically applying the revision to the at least one attribute of the at least one element of the table so as to modify any other region affected by the change in the manner consistent with the change in the visual appearance of the decorative panel.

(See, Rempell, figure 37, and paragraph [0144], teaching the menus and sub-menus, which are defined as a set of DHTML (dynamic hypertext markup language) objects, one for each menu choice, nested inside an DHTML object that defines the entire menu.

Each menu object is given absolute positioning, while the menu items are given absolute positioning relative the menu objects origin. Both the entire menu and each choice are assigned CSS styles to define their visual appearances.

Rempell does not explicitly teach, "(a) detecting the change in the visual appearance the visual appearance of the decorative panel."

See, Teague, Chapter 11, The Document Object Model, pages 177-202, particularly pages 181-185, also see Tables 11.1 and 11.2 and 11.7, teaching the method of how Event Handlers works in the DHTML, CSS and DOM environment, wherein detecting an event is applied. This process starts with the visitor's action (the mouseover) and ends with the browser's reaction (changing the graphic). In between, the browser senses the action (event), triggers a function, and uses the DOM to change the image's source to a different graphic file.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Rempell's teaching, provide a panel's interface objects built with HTML, Dynamic HTML (DHTML), JavaScript, and Cascading Style Sheets (CSS), to include a means of detecting the change in the visual appearance of the decorative panel.

The suggestion or motivation to modify this combination to provide the following advantages: supported by most browsers, small file sizes, no plug-ins required, easy to learn, fast development, faster Web experience, no Java programming required. See, Teague, page 171.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Rempell and Teague to result in the invention specified in claim 1.)

Regarding dependent claim 2:

Claim 2 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 3:

The method of Claim 1, wherein the table comprises a hypertext markup language (HTML) table.

(See, Rempell, paragraph [0176], teaching a document in HTML.)

Regarding dependent claim 4:

The method of Claim 1, further comprising the step of enabling a user to change the visual appearance of the decorative panel through one of:

- (a) a graphical user interface (GUI); and*
- (b) a document object model (DOM) using a scripting language.*

(See, Rempell, figure 37, and paragraph [0102], teaching a representation of the graphical user interface (GUI) presented by the build tool.)

Rempell does not explicitly teach, "(b) a document object model (DOM) using scripting language."

See, Teague, Chapter 11, The Document Object Model, pages 177-202, particularly pages 179-185, also see Tables 11.1 and 11.2 and 11.7, teaching the method of how Event Handlers work in the DHTML, CSS, DOM environments, wherein Web pages created with a CSS can have their properties changed dynamically, while they are on the screen, through a scripting language and the DOM (table 11.1), for example VBScript used in Internet Explorer.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Rempell, teaching to provide a panel's interface objects built with HTML, Dynamic HTML (DHTML), JavaScript, and Cascading Style Sheets (CSS), with the teaching of Teague, teaching to include a means of detecting the change in the visual appearance the visual appearance of decorative panel.

The suggestion or motivation for the combination would have been to provide the following obvious advantages: supported by most browsers, small file sizes, no plug-ins required, easy to learn, fast development, faster Web experience, and no Java programming required. See, Teague, page 171, teaching these advantages.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Rempell and Teague to result in the invention specified in claim 4.)

Regarding independent claim 5:

The method of Claim 1, wherein the change in the visual appearance of the decorative panel comprises one of resizing the decorative panel, adding a region to the decorative panel, deleting a region from the decorative panel, relocating a region within the decorative panel, resizing a region of the decorative panel, and revising a visual characteristic of a region of the decorative panel.

(See, Rempell, [0072], teaching the dynamic web page resizing tool.)

Regarding dependent claim 6:

Claim 6 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim ____ and, further in view of the following, is rejected along the same rationale.

See, Rempell, paragraph [0008], teaching a multi-dimensional array structured database.

Regarding dependent claim 7:

Claim 7 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claims 1-4 and 6 and, in further consideration of the following, is rejected along the same rationale.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to defining a hierarchical partition tree of nodes specifying coordinates of a location and bounding area of the regions of the decorative panel for the obvious and beneficial purpose that graphical areas were commonly known to one of ordinary skill in the art to be defined by their coordinates and locations.

Regarding dependent claim 8:

Claim 8 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 9:

Claim 9 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claims 1 and 4 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 10:

Claim 10 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1 and, in further consideration of the following, is rejected along the same rationale.

See, Rempell, paragraph [0076], teaching the runtime process, which invokes the web page generation, scaling, screen resolution and size (formatting).

Regarding dependent claim 11:

Claim 11 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 12:

Claim 12 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1 and, in further consideration of the following, is rejected along the same rationale.

See, Rempell, paragraph [0144], teaching that the table is no longer associated with the decorative panel if the revision is not the result of formatting the table to provide a decorative panel conforming to at least one of the patterns of the region.

Regarding dependent claim 13:

Claim 13 incorporated substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 14:

Claim 14 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1 and, further in view of the following, is rejected along the same rationale.

See, Rempell, paragraph [0001], teaching a computer system used for building a web site. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that a commonly known prior art computer that would have been used to build a web site would necessarily have included a processor, a display in communication with the processor, and a memory to carry our instructions.

Regarding dependent claim 15:

Claim 15 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claims 1 and 14 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 16:

Claim 16 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claims 1, 6, and 14 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 17:

Claim 17 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claims 1, 4, and 14 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 18:

Claim 18 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claims 1 and 14 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 19:

Claim 19 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claims 1 and 14 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 20:

Claim 20 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claims 1, 11, and 14 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 21:

Claim 21 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1 and, further in view of the following, is rejected along the same rationale.

See, Rempell, paragraph [0001], teaching a computer system used for building a web site. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that a commonly known prior art computer that would have been used to build a web site would necessarily have included a processor, a display in communication with the processor, and a memory to carry our instructions.

Regarding dependent claim 22:

Claim 22 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claims 1 and 11 and is rejected along the same rationale.

8. It is noted that any citations to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art.

See, MPEP 2123.

Response to Arguments

Applicants' arguments filed August 8, 2006 have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive.

Regarding rejection of claims 1, 14, and 21:

FIRST: Applicants argue that the reference fails to teach or suggest "(1) a revision to the at least one attribute of the at least one element of *the table*; (2) producing a change in the visual appearance of the *decorative panel*; and, (3) automatically applying the revision so as to modify any other region affected by the change in a manner consistent with the change in the visual appearance of the decorative panel." See, Remarks, pages 11-18, emphasis in the original.

The Examiner disagrees.

See, Rempell, figure 37, and paragraph [0010], teaching that the interface includes a panel (item 400) the build frame (item 500), and its objects, including a menu bar (item 410), pop-up windows (item 480), the panel's interface objects, tool bar (item 440) color and alert message interface technologies, built with HTML, Dynamic HTML (DHTML), JavaScript, and Cascading Style Sheets (CSS).

See also, Rempell, figures 46 and 47, and paragraph [0120] teaching a visualization of an implementation of a JavaScript child window, wherein a change text button style pop-up window, Screen shot FIG. 47, shows the result after the user selected the "Define the Mouse Down Text Button Style" child pop-up window.

See also, Rempell, figure 37, and paragraph [0144], teaching the menus and sub-menus, which are defined as a set of DHTML (dynamic hypertext markup language) objects, one for each menu choice, nested inside an DHTML object that defines the entire menu. Each menu object is given absolute positioning, while the

menu items are given absolute positioning relative the menu objects origin. Both the entire menu and each choice are assigned CSS styles to define their visual appearances.

Rempell does not explicitly teach, "(a) detecting the change in the visual appearance the visual appearance of the decorative panel."

See, Teague, Chapter 11, The Document Object Model, pages 177-202, particularly pages 181-185, also see Tables 11.1 and 11.2 and 11.7, teaching the method of how Event Handlers works in the DHTML, CSS and DOM environment, wherein detecting an event is applied. This process starts with the visitor's action (the mouseover) and ends with the browser's reaction (changing the graphic). In between, the browser senses the action (event), triggers a function, and uses the DOM to change the image's source to a different graphic file.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Rempell's teaching, provide a panel's interface objects built with HTML, Dynamic HTML (DHTML), JavaScript, and Cascading Style Sheets (CSS), to include a means of detecting the change in the visual appearance of the decorative panel.

The suggestion or motivation to modify this combination to provide the following advantages: supported by most browsers, small file sizes, no plug-ins required, easy to learn, fast development, faster Web experience, no Java programming required. See, Teague, page 171.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to have combined the teachings of Rempell and Teague to result in the invention specified in claim 1.

SECOND: Applicants argue that the reference fails to teach or suggest "automatically applying a revision so as to modify any other region affected by the change." See, Remarks, page 15.

The Examiner disagrees.

See, Rempell, figure 37, and paragraph [0144], teaching the menus and sub-menus, which are defined as a set of DHTML (Dynamic Hypertext Markup Language) objects, one for each menu choice, nested inside an DHTML object that defines the entire menu. Each menu object is given absolute positioning, while the menu items are given absolute positioning relative the menu objects origin. Both the entire menu and each choice are assigned CSS styles to define their visual appearances.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael K. Botts whose telephone number is 571-272-5533. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:00-4:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MKB/mkb


Heather R. Herndon
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100